

**32692**

Customer Number

PATENT  
Docket No.: 59468US005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

CHAD J. CARTER, MOSES M. DAVID,  
LARRY H. DODGE, MICHAEL B. FREE,  
SAMUEL J. GASON, JOHN S.  
HUIZINGA, RAYMOND P. JOHNSTON,  
BRINDA B. LAKSHMI, PATRICK A.  
MACH, LARRY G. MARTIN, MIKHAIL  
PEKUROVSKY, MARK S. SCHABERG,  
JEFFREY D. SMITH, KENNETH B.  
WOOD and WENYUAN XU

Serial No.: 10/596,956  
Filed: December 17, 2004  
(May 25, 2007)

For: ACOUSTO-MECHANICAL  
DETECTION SYSTEMS AND  
METHODS OF USE

Group Art Unit: 1641

Confirmation No. 2943

Examiner: J. Diramio

**CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on and the date indicated below via the Office electronic filing system.

August 17, 2009

/Judy L. Hansen/

Date

Signature

Judy L. Hansen

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated July 15, 2009, in which the Examiner applied a restriction requirement to Claims 1-22 (Group I); Claims 23-28 (Group II); Claims 29-39 (Group III); Claims 40-45 (Group IV) and Claims 46 and 47 (Group V). Applicants elect to prosecute Claims 1-22 (Group I) without traverse.

In the event Applicants elected Group I, the Examiner required an election of species to a type of flow front control feature from the group of (1) discrete structures (claim 3); (2) channels (claim 4); or (3) hydrophobic material (claim 5). Applicants elect with traverse the discrete structures, which are encompassed by claim 3. Currently, at least claims 1-3 and 6-22 are generic to the elected species.

The Examiner is requested to note that MPEP 809.02 provides that "when a generic claim is subsequently held to be allowable . . . and all claims are embraced by an allowable generic claim . . . Applicant should be advised of the allowable generic claim and that the claims to the non-elected species are no longer withdrawn since they are fully embraced by the allowed generic claim." Thus, the election to claim 3 is with traverse to the extent that it is understood that (a) the requirement will be withdrawn upon the finding of an allowable genus; and (b) any species withdrawn from consideration will be transferred to the elected subject matter unless it is found patentably distinct from the elected or allowed claims. Applicants traverse on the grounds that the generic claim includes sufficiently few related species, i.e., discrete structures, channels and hydrophobic material, that a search and examination of all the species at one time would not impose a serious burden on the Examiner.

If a telephonic interview with the Applicants' undersigned representative would be helpful in resolving any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (651) 733-2180.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nancy M. Lambert/

Nancy M. Lambert  
Registration No. 44,856  
Attorney for Applicants

NML:jlh/#739793 Response to Restriction  
Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
P.O. Box 33427  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55133-3427  
(651) 733-2180  
Facsimile: (651) 736-3833

Dated: August 17, 2009